

Hattori et al., and further in view of *Etoh* (USP 5,729,289); and rejected claims 8-9 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.*, and further in view of *Kawada et al.* (USP 5,179,437) or *Konishi et al.* (USP 5,461,429). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 -
Ueda et al./Hibino et al./Hattori et al.

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts *Ueda et al.* discloses a signal correction circuit for subjecting the implied signal to a correction for outdoor display, citing to reference numerals 24-27. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of this reference. It is respectfully submitted that *Ueda et al.* discloses a backlighting and color control arrangement for LCD-type video camera viewfinder having multiple backlighting sources. The viewfinder as depicted in Fig. 1 includes a viewfinder barrel 1, liquid crystal plate or LCD 2 and eyepiece 3 disposed in front of a front surface of LCD 2 on an eyepiece portion 4 side. A back light 5 for applying light to a rear surface of the LCD 2 is disposed at a certain distance or interval behind the LCD 2 (col. 2, ll. 52-60).

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a liquid crystal display device comprising a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display. It is respectfully submitted that the LCD 2 of *Ueda et al.* is viewed through viewfinder barrel 1 and eyepiece 3. As such, there is no image signal correction for outdoor display. While *Ueda et al.* corrects the color of the displayed image in response to the external light and the light from the back light, *Ueda et al.* fails to subject the applied image to a correction for outdoor display. *Ueda et al.*'s LCD

is not displayed outdoors, but in viewfinder barrel 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Ueda et al.* fails to disclose subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display. It is respectfully submitted that both *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.* fail to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Ueda et al.* as neither of the references teach a signal correction circuit for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display, assuming these references are combinable, which Applicant does not admit. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not obvious, and thus allowable, over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.*

It is respectfully submitted that claim 4 contains elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and, thus, claim 4, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable over *Ueda et al.* in view of *Hibino et al.* and *Hattori et al.*

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 5 and 10, the Examiner admits that *Ueda et al.* fails to teach subjecting the applied image signal to gamma correction. However, the Examiner relies on *Hibino et al.* to cure the deficiencies of *Ueda et al.* Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the references.

As noted above, in viewing the LCD of *Ueda et al.*, the user must look through eyepiece 3 through viewfinder barrel 1. As such, there is no outdoor light that would affect the LCD display of *Ueda et al.* Therefore, there would be no motivation to combine the gamma correction teachings of *Hibino et al.* in order to compensate for the outdoor light. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not utilize the teachings of *Hibino et al.* teaching a gamma correction to correct any outdoor light affecting the

display on the LCD of *Ueda et al.* As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 10 are allowable over the references as cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, we respectfully request the Examiner to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at (703) 205-8000, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Marc S. Weiner, Reg. No. 32,181

msw
MSW/CMV/jdm
0905-0248P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000